

USSN 10/525,228  
NAKANISHI *et al.*

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are submitted for examination with claims 1-17 being currently amended.

The claims have been amended to replace “nanometer size fine particles” with “fine nanoparticles”. The term “nanometer size particles” is a mistranslation of the term “nanoparticles”. Support for “nanoparticles” is in Fig. 1 of the specification showing a quinacridone crystal of Example 1 having a scale measurement of 100nm. The well known dictionary definition of “nanoparticles” is microscopic particles having at least one dimension that is 1-100nm. Similarly, Fig. 2 of the specification shows a distribution of average particles size of the crystals of Example 1 in the range of 1-100nm. A partial copy of IUPAC is introduced as Appendix C as Encyclopedic and dictionary evidence.

The spelling for “1,3-dimethyl-2-imidazolidinone” has been corrected throughout the claims.

The term “organic solvent” has been incorporated throughout the claims where appropriate. Antecedent support is found in claim 1.

Amended claims 11 and 12 recite a mixed amide organic solvent containing 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone, 2-pyrrolidinone or 1,3-dimethyl-2-imidazolidinone supported by the specification at page 7, lines 4-5 from bottom.

The specification has been amended as suggested to change the title from “Brief Captions of Drawing” to “Brief Description Of The Drawings” shown in Appendix B.

The specification has been also amended to recite “the particle of the Pc pigment used is 1 $\mu$ m

USSN 10/525,228  
NAKANISHI *et al.*

0.1µm or less". Support for 0.1µm is found in the originally filed PCT application, a copy of which is attached as Appendix D.

No new matter within the meaning of § 132 has been added.

Regarding two different claims numbered "claim 15" in the preliminary amendment, it is noted that the presently submitted fresh claim set does not contain the redundancy and recites proper parenthetical expressions.

Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to enter the indicated amendments of Appendices A and B and allow all the presently pending claims in view of the evidence and following remarks.

1. **Rejection of Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action stated:

Applicant fails to adequately describe the particle size encompassed by the phrase "nanometer size fine particles" as the specification does not recite the sizes encompassed by the specification. Is applicant intending this phrase to mean 100 nanometer or less or does applicant intend the phrase to represent 1 nanometer? Exactly what size is encompassed by the phrase? Clarification is requested.

The claims have been amended to recite "nanoparticles". The term is supported by the

USSN 10/525,228  
NAKANISHI *et al.*

specification according to well known definitions within the art.

Nanoparticles are generally defined as microscopic particles having at least one dimension that is 1-100nm. The presently pending phrase “nanometer size fine particles” was intended to be “nanoparticles” but was not properly translated into English. Support for this particle size is in Fig. 1 of the specification, which shows a quinacridone crystal of Example 1 having a scale measurement of 100nm. Similarly, Fig. 2 of the specification shows a distribution of average particles size of the crystals of Example 1 within the range of 1-100nm. The claims being thus described by “nanoparticles”, there is no question as to what is being claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims satisfy the written description requirement and request withdrawal of the rejection.

2. **Rejection of Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. The Office Action stated:

In claim 1 the phrases “high concentrated” and “poor solvent” are vague and indefinite as the terms “high” and “poor” are relative terms. The phrase “the obtained pigments solution” lacks proper antecedent basis. It is unclear as to what the phrase [sic] “which is compatible with said solvent and is poor solvent to the pigment” refers to”. That is what is compatible with said solvent and what is poor solvent? Clarification is requested.

USSN 10/525,228  
NAKANISHI *et al.*

The term “high” has been deleted from the claims. The term “poor solvent” is definite as claimed because the specification provides some standard for measuring the relative degree of “poorness” by giving specific examples. Paragraph [0017] of the published specification recites that the “poor solvent” can be water, alcohol solvents, ketone solvents, ether solvents, aromatic solvents, carbon disulfide, aliphatic solvents, nitrile solvents, sulfoxide solvents, halide solvents, ester solvents, ionic solution or mixed solution consisting of these two or more solvents. Hence, when read in light of the specification and claims, the term “poor solvent” is definite.

Regarding the phrase “which is compatible with said solvent and is poor solvent to the pigment”, the claim has been amended to show that the “obtained pigment solution” is poured into a “second solution” where that “second solution” is compatible with the “organic solvent”.

The Office Action further stated:

In claims 4-6 the phrase “at least the one” is not proper Markush terminology. In claims 7-10 it is unclear as to what is meant by the phrase “these two or more solvents”.

Claims 4-6 have been amended into proper Markush format.

The Office Action still further stated:

In claims 7-10 it is unclear as to what is meant by the phrase “these two or more solvents”.

The claims 7-10 have been amended to recite “a mixture of two or more solvents thereof”.

The Office Action additionally stated:

In claims 11-12 it is unclear as to what is meant by the phrase “using

USSN 10/525,228  
NAKANISHI *et al.*

solvent". What is it used as or how is it used? The phrase [sic] "containing said solvents more than 50 volume % as a solvent for the organic solvent" is confusing. It is unclear as to what is meant by this phrase and it is unclear as to which solvent is being referred to. Is it the amide organic solvent or the poor solvent? Clarification is requested. The phrase "at least the one" is not proper Markush terminology.

The claims 11-12 have been amended to replace the phrase "using water and/or alcoholic solvent as a poor solvent" with "said poor solvent is water and/or alcoholic solvent". The phrase "containing said solvents more than 50 volume % as a solvent for the organic solvent" is replaced with "a mixed amide organic solvent containing 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone, 2-pyrrolidinone or 1,3-dimethyl-2-imidazolidinone in an amount that is more than 50 volume %" thereby making clear what the amide organic solvent can contain and the relation to the organic solvent by volume percentage.

The Office Action continued further:

In claims 13-17 the phrases "the preparation of solution", "the condition", "the prepared high concentrated organic pigment solution of 0.5 mmol/L to 100 mmol/L", and "the lowest temperature of liquid state" lack proper antecedent basis.

Claims 13-17 have been amended to recite the term "organic solvent" throughout. The claims have also been amended to replace the phrase "the prepared high concentrated organic pigment solution" with "an obtained concentrated organic solvent" and replace the phrase "the lowest temperature of liquid state" with "a lowest temperature of a liquid state". Hence, proper antecedent basis is provided.

USSN 10/525,228  
NAKANISHI *et al.*

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention and request withdrawal of the rejection.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the pending claims and allow the pending claims. Favorable action with an early allowance of the claims pending is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**HAHN & VOIGHT PLLC**



Attorney for Applicants  
Roger C. Hahn  
Reg. No. 46,376

**HAHN & VOIGHT PLLC**  
1012 14<sup>TH</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 620  
202-637-0020